

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 vvvv.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/912,442	01	7/26/2001	Masanao Kohashi	074129-0485	074129-0485 4440	
22428	7590	07/19/2004		EXAMINER		
FOLEY AT		NER	THOMPSON, CAMIE S			
SUITE 500 3000 K STR				ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
WASHING	TON, DC	20007		1774		
				DATE MAILED: 07/19/2004	‡	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*			/
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/912,442	KOHASHI ET AL.	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Camie S Thompson	1774	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	tion in
PERIOD FOR RI	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (c)	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ice later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate or the final (opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);		,
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims	S
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1,4-6 and 10.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 7 and 8.			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:			

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendment of claim 10 narrows the scope of the claims. An additional search is required...

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the McClary reference does not disclose the main dispersion peak temperature of loss tangent in the measurement of dynamic viscoelasticity at 110 Hz of less than o equal to 147.0 degrees [element (d)] of instant claim 1. The McClary reference discloses a polyester multifilament yarn comprising at least 90 mol percent of polyethylene terephthalate having an intrinsic viscosity of 0.85 dl/g as does applicant. Additionally, the McClary reference discloses a birefrigence of about 0.190 to .205, which is within the range of applicant's claimed birefringence. It would be expected that the main dispersion peak temperature of loss of tangent in the measurement of dynamic viscoelasticity at 110 Hz is less than 147.0 deg C would be the same for both the instant invention and the McClary reference in that McClary and applicant have the sam product. Additionally, the main dispersion peak temperature of loss tangent in the measurement of dynamic viscoelasticity is a process limitation. The measurement of dynamic viscoelasticity is not given any patentable weight in a product claim. The patentability of a product depends solely on the product itself. Both McClary and applicant have a polyester fiber comprising polyethylene terephthalate at 90 mol percent or higher and having an intrinsic viscosity of 0.85 dl/g. Applicant argues that the fiber of the McClary reference is outside of the range because McClary is referring to a drawn yarn. Applicant does not claim an undrawn yarn in instant claim 1. The rejection is maintained .

RENA DYE

PRIMARY EXAMINER